

612 being obliged to take him into consideration before proceeding
829 to some course of action.

612 Consultation between trusted kinsmen about their various
affairs is continual. The enterprise itself may be of almost any
kind, the marriage of a son or daughter, a decision whether or
not to sell sheep, to raise money for the payment of a debt, or
the acceptance or non-acceptance of an offer of winter pasture.
Similarly, when a man is involved in some crisis, a fight with
another shepherd, a brawl at a marriage feast, or a difficult
court case, kinsmen come to him of their own accord with
advice and criticism. In this way he learns which courses of
action will enjoy the moral support of his kin and which will
not. And since a man loses prestige if his kinsman acts wrongly,
612 he will always exhort him to an honourable course of action
558 however difficult the circumstances. For his part, the principal
actor is influenced by the fear of losing the support of his kins-
men, as he may do if he takes decisions which lose him prestige.
His kinsmen can then only protect their own prestige by isolat-
ing themselves to a greater or lesser degree from social contact
with him. Consequently this consultation between kinsmen is
not only to a man's advantage in terms of his own prestige, but
it is also a subtle sanction for right ways of acting in the
community as a whole.

612 In economic matters, too, a shepherd looks to his kinsmen
476 for help and co-operation. Quite apart from the deep distrust
which divides unrelated persons, shame prevents a man from
seeking assistance outside the kindred, since this would be a tacit
admission that he had been rejected by his own kinsmen. Thus

[426] sentiment and convention lead in the same direction. A shep-
herd lives from one monetary crisis to another. When he needs
a small money loan for an operation fee at a Jannina hospital
or for the expenses of a wedding, he is often unable to persuade
a merchant to grant him an additional advance; but he seldom
fails to raise it from his kinsmen if they have the money in
hand. Economic co-operation may take other forms. The con-
612 dition of the family's flocks is not only the basis of its physical
476 existence but the source of pride and prestige. A man fears to
233 meet the appraising eyes of another if his animals are in a
meagre and spindle-shanked condition. But grazing, both in
the Zagori and in the winter pastures, varies considerably from

SEPARATION

79

children and babies playing, fighting, and screaming. Except in 596 the early evening when a sleep of exhaustion stills their activi- 578 ties, the scene is one of constant tumult. In this situation a brother cannot strike the children of another. *A fortiori* one wife cannot in any way interfere with the children of another wife. When a father separates two embattled cousins he pushes the child which is not his own out of the way telling it to go to its mother, and then turns to deal his own child a slap across the face. Clearly these symptoms of disorder and indiscipline in the extended family result from the growing isolation of each of the constituent elementary families. The autonomy of each elementary family in regard to all its internal relationships and the control of its children is not compatible with the co-existence of the families in a single domestic unit.

When an extended family of several brothers and their wives 596 has lived as a single household for a number of years it is not 626 unusual to hear in the gossip of other families some criticism of this arrangement. In fact, few extended families survive for longer than ten years without the separation of at least some brothers. No doubt the criticism of the extended family which does remain united beyond this limit may be attributed, in some measure, to the jealousy of other groups in which brothers have not been able to show quite the same mutual devotion. Yet, if they have succeeded in living up to one kinship value, their detractors are right to point out that they have failed to maintain other and more important values. Thus one critic of the Ferendinos family said that it was not right that the second and third brothers in the family, who each had two children, were not yet complete masters in their own households. They were assisting their elder brother with his larger family to a degree which was scarcely honourable when they had their own children to care for. Moreover, it was added, everybody knew that the wives were at each others' throats. It was dangerous to allow this state of affairs to continue because it would inevitably end in quarrels between the brothers themselves. 578

3. SEPARATION

There is no precise formalized rule as to when brothers ought 591 to separate. Some informants say that when an elder brother 596 has a family of his own, and his younger brother is also married 591

THE EXTENDED FAMILY

582 physique remains unimpaired he cannot delay the marriage of
 596 his first son beyond his thirty-first year without suffering con-
 siderable and growing criticism in the community. He must,
 then, bow to the inevitable, arrange the marriage of his son and
 in a short time (at the birth of the first grandchild) hand over
 control; for, as we have stressed, it is not compatible with the
 values of this community for a married man with a child to be
 still under parental control and not master in his own house.
 But fathers do not normally hand over control until they have
 to. An elder brother, who has no sisters to guard or provide for,
 may marry a year or two sooner, but the difference is not
 marked.

[624] Old age, then, and the fear of public criticism and ridicule
 generally force a man to arrange the eldest son's marriage be-
 fore his thirty-second birthday. No consideration of the needs
 of sisters will normally delay this event. And the marriage of
 other brothers in the middle of the birth order of the sibling
 group are arranged with the same upper limit in mind. On the
 other hand, the youngest brother will almost certainly not
 marry until all the sisters have found husbands. Through the
 social equivalence of brothers, the duty of watching over and,
 if need be, avenging the honour of the sisters, is delegated to
 the unmarried member of the group of brothers. This arrange-
 ment recognizes the conflict between the roles of father/husband
 and brother when they are played simultaneously by the same
 person; a conflict which, according to Sarakatsan kinship values,
 can only be resolved in favour of the father/husband. It is an
 arrangement which, on occasion, may delay considerably the
 marriage of the youngest brother.

TABLE III

CHILDREN OF EUTHYMIOS CARVOUNIS

Group of Siblings		Age at marriage	Age in 1953
Demetrios	(M)	31	42
George	(M)	30	38
Michael	(M)	32	36
Elias	(M)	Unmarried	35
Amalia	(F)	24	32
Evangelike	(F)	28	28

[p. 25]

V

COLLATERAL KINSMEN

1. FAVOURS AND OBLIGATIONS

THE Sarakatsani assume that ill-faith, doubt, and suspicion characterize the relations of men who are not kinsmen. In contrast, they think that the values and attitudes which make possible the communion of kinsmen are expressed in the meaning of *ἐμπιστοσύνη*, faith, trust, confidence; or *πίστη*, faith, belief. It is, then, not surprising that unrelated men very rarely co-operate in the management of their sheep or in any other venture; except, necessarily, the marriages of their children.

The rights and obligations of kinship are of a general and diffuse kind, not restricted to specific situations. A man is confident that a kinsman will keep a secret. He opens his mind to him freely because he knows he will use discretion in what he should pass on and what he must not. He believes the information that a kinsman gives to him, and he uses it as a basis for action without the fear of a lie or a trap. He is confident that when his own conduct is being evaluated by the community his kinsmen will support his case; and for his part he will not suffer in silence the public criticism of any of his kin. Above all, he feels secure and confident that when he is in difficulty there will be people who care for his interests and will give him assistance. These sentiments of confidence and trust are prescribed and follow from the simple existence of the kin relationship; they do not depend on the history of a gradually developing intimacy.

When a Sarakatsanos receives a favour from another, he must show gratitude. 'One good turn deserves another' (*ἡ χάρη θέλει ἀντιχάρη*). Even if only between the acceptance of some service and its later repayment, gratitude must for a while act as a makeweight in the balance. Not to show gratitude for help, which has been freely given, is behaviour open to severe public reproach. But to be grateful is to be 'obliged' (*ὀφειλωμένος*); and this is an admission of inequality and even of weakness. The rare attempts at co-operation between unrelated persons have invariably ended in accusations and counter accusations that one man has done more for the other who, in return, has

612 in time, and after long consideration, may provide the offender
183 with an excuse. There is no basis for forgiveness and reconciliation.

612 The support of kinsmen is also withdrawn sometimes in a
626 manner which does not necessarily imply a permanent rupture of social relations, though it may come to this in the end. I have previously emphasized the importance of the moral support of kinsmen when the community is evaluating a man's conduct.

[539] The idea that a man must defend the actions of his kinsmen is expressed in the proverb, 'Ο δουλός μπορεί νά πῇ μὰ δέν μπορεί ν'ἀκούσῃ. Literally this means, 'A relation can speak to his kinsman but he cannot listen to something about him', that is to say he can scold a kinsman for his shortcomings in private, but he will not allow others to accuse him in public. This in general is true, but it depends upon the possibility of advancing some reasonable explanation of a kinsman's conduct. Where a man has behaved in a manner clearly at variance with the values of the community a kinsman is forced to abandon him, and even to take some part in condemning his conduct. For if he continues to support his cause his own reputation and that of his family will suffer. By condemning the actions of his kinsmen he expresses in an unequivocal fashion that he supports the values of the community; and he maintains a measure of social distance between himself and his kinsman. In this way he hopes to avoid the taint of association with his conduct and the shame which accompanies it.

684 The history of Nasios illustrates this process. One afternoon
612 in the summer of 1953 he happened to meet Mitrina Mastoras
629 on the hill-side above his village, and there, after failing to win her willing co-operation, he attempted to take her 'by force' (μὲ τὸ ζόρι); but unsuccessfully according to Mitrina's story. The terrified woman ran down the hill to the huts of her second cousin for, at the time, her own husband was away from home. The cousin at once sent word to the husband who returned immediately. He surprised Nasios, knocked him to the ground, and had already drawn his knife to settle the matter when he was seized from behind by two villagers. In terror Nasios escaped to his home.

Public opinion was unanimous in condemning Nasios. This was not the first time he had attacked women, although on the

THE EFFECTIVE KINDRED

113

two previous occasions he had more wisely confined his attentions to gipsy women. His family was in any case poor and of low prestige. There was nothing at all to be said in his favour. He had a number of kinsmen among the Sarakatsani who graze the lands of the same village, and of these the closest was Evangelos Balatsos, a first cousin. Evangelos and the other kinsmen all joined in the universal condemnation of Nasios. During the weeks which followed Evangelos made a point of going each day to the home of Nasios and unnerving him with imaginary accounts of the plots and ambushes which the husband of Mitrina was preparing to lure him to his death. So thorough were his efforts that for the next two months, until the Sarakatsani left for the winter pastures, Nasios was never seen outside his hut in daylight. Evangelos after his daily visits to Nasios made his way to the coffee-shop where he described to an appreciative audience the state of affairs in Nasios's household; how he remained each night, sleepless behind the door with axe in hand, and how his wife was obliged under cover of darkness to remove his faeces from the hut. In this fashion Evangelos took a leading part in the shaming of his kinsman, and saved his own name by denying solidarity with his kinsman and damaging his reputation. 684
612
627

The possibility of losing the moral and practical support of kinsmen, perhaps for ever, is clearly a most powerful sanction of the norms of kinship behaviour and the values of the wider community. If Nasios, a poor man who herded the sheep of villagers, had possessed a substantial flock and had therefore been dependent on the help of kinsmen in a 'company', this estrangement from his kinsmen would have affected him even more seriously than it did. It is also evident that the application of this sanction by the kinsman is itself sanctioned by the threat that a man and his family may lose prestige if he does not temporarily abandon the evil-doer. Since the interests of the family always take precedence over obligations of individual collateral kinship, there is never any doubt that a man will conform. We see, not for the first time, the connexion between prestige values and the isolation of the family; for these values necessarily threaten the solidarity of any personal relationship or social grouping which may conflict with a man's duty to uphold, or promote, the prestige of his family. 626 ●
612
626
558
577

593 Publicly a husband addresses his wife in a stern severe voice. Requests are commands, barked out in sharp phrases. It is important for a man's self-regard (*ἐγωισμός*) that other men should see that he is master in his own house. In public the wife is meek and modest, silent and submissive. She does not smile at him or laugh with him before strangers. But in the seclusion of the hut matters are otherwise. She abandons the mask of expressionless humility and discusses with her husband all the affairs of the family, putting forward her own suggestions in a respectful but fearless fashion. Yet even here respect is implicit and a wife must never use tones of mockery or abuse towards her husband.

● [626] Obedience to her husband is a moral imperative for the wife. She will not be excused by public opinion, however badly she may have been treated by the man. She cannot refuse to cohabit with him sexually. Conversely, the act of disobedience

593 by which she damages her husband most severely is adultery.

839 In adultery she makes her husband a cuckold (*κεφαλαίος*), one
558 who wears a horn. 'She puts horns on him' (*τοῦ βάζει κέρατα*), it is said. The implication that the cuckold wears a horn may be an ironical allusion to the sexual potency which his wife's action suggests he does not possess.¹ Adultery attacks the moral integrity and honour of the family and makes a laughing-stock

[684] of its leader and head. Thus, Sarakatsani always insist that if a husband surprises the guilty parties in the act, he must first kill his wife and then her seducer. The axiomatic acceptance of family obligations, the uncompromising character of the sanction, and the extreme difficulty of conducting such a liaison secretly, are all factors which contribute to the extremely low incidence of adultery. Indeed, since 1950, there appears to have been only one clear and unambiguous case of discovered adultery.

593 The disobedience of the wife in the sense of flatly refusing to do the spoken bidding of her husband is also rare. This situation or the mutual irritation which arises over the 'trivia' of communal living results in the wife receiving a beating with a stick. The Sarakatsani of both sexes accept the right of a husband to strike a disobedient or erring wife. It is also true, however, that
[572] men who are continually beating their wives (and certain men

¹ Cf. Pitt-Rivers, op. cit., p. 116; and Onians, op. cit., p. 243.

596 for these arrangements², is public opinion. *The sanction*
 593 a man may be to hand over the reins to his son, he knows that he
 621 will lose less personal prestige by moving into retirement than
 558 by attempting to hold power against the conventions of
 customary usage. He is also aware that any temporizing over
 this problem will lead to the kind of friction with his son that is
 unlikely to remain private and may result in a further loss of
 prestige for the whole family.

596 There are two other circumstances which may help to per-
 593 suade a father to cede his position at the customary time.
 233 Grazing land in summer for a herd of three hundred sheep and
 461 goats represents a considerable area of mountainous country.
 886 The journey from the huts of the family near the village to the
 farthest limits of the summer grazing is very often a walk of
 two or three hours, climbing steeply the whole way along
 difficult rock-strewn paths generally no wider than a rabbit's
 track. Such a journey two or three times a week for a man in
 his early sixties, which is the age a father is likely to have reached
 when his own son approaches the age of marriage, is a severe
 physical strain. But if the family head is not physically able to
 see for himself the condition of the grass and the state of his
 animals, his shepherd sons cease to treat his instructions or
 criticisms with any seriousness, and in respect to animal
 management virtually arrange matters for themselves. From
 this point it is a short step to question the father's authority in
 other matters. Physical or mental feebleness of the father is
 invariably the explanation of a son assuming control of family
 affairs at an early age.

886 The second circumstance has to do with the relation of the
 212 family to the outside world. With few exceptions the shepherds
 178 who are today over sixty years of age are illiterate. Under
 596 modern conditions these men are at an obvious disadvantage in
 understanding the content of government agricultural regu-
 lations and in filling up the increasing number of printed
 forms. Unlike their more sophisticated and literate sons, men
 of this age group do not understand the ways of minor officials.
 "They don't know how to go about things in the offices" (δὲν
 ξέρουν τὰ γραφεῖα), their sons explain. In part, the prestige of
 letters is attributable to the idea that they are the necessary
 weapons for a successful resistance or adaption to bureaucratic

² [i.e. the taking over of family authority by the son]
 --- Analysis

PARENTS AND CHILDREN

163

administration. It is easy to understand that if the head of the family must be constantly asking his young son to read, explain, and advise on all written documents, he finds it difficult to maintain his authority until his son has reached the customary age of marriage. Significantly, the sack in which the business papers and account books are kept has become in recent years a symbol of the authority of the head of family, who alone has the right to open it. 596
212
178
[65]

In the majority of cases, however, these two circumstances, although they may cause difficulties, do not force or even allow a father to hand over executive control much earlier than custom demands. If, for example, a father of fifty-nine hands over the control of family affairs to a son of twenty-six, he will undoubtedly be considered a man of weak character even where it is known that he suffers some physical disability. He must, for reasons of personal and family prestige, attempt to assert and exercise his authority. Sons are not unaware of the father's position and difficulties. During the last years of a father's exercise of power a degree of rivalry between a father and his sons is always present, but because fathers and sons, together, accept responsibility for the prestige of the family, they guard most carefully against any public expression of their differences. 886
596
626
558

After the eldest son assumes control, the father continues to do such work as he is capable of. It is generally a task of his own selection and the senior son is careful to avoid giving direct instructions of any kind to his father. There are always a few sick sheep or late lambs which need to be grazed close to the huts, and occasionally he will spend a day with one of the flocks to relieve a son. In some families with many sons, where there is no essential task for the old father to perform, he will create some activity to occupy his time. The old father of John Charisis daily saddles and exercises a favourite horse. When visitors ask where the old father is, his sons reply with affectionate but patronizing smiles that he is out with his horse again. The visitors join in the laughter at the old man's expense and the sons do not take offence, for this is a general attitude to old people in the community. They are respected if they have led honourable lives, yet in relation to present preoccupations they are unimportant. The old father always expresses his views 596
887
596
888
[887]

- 593 identification of brothers tolerates some variation in individual skill, strength, and energy, and a man does not complain although it may be clear that he contributes more to the total effort than his brother. For if in this fellowship my brother is as myself, a strict sense of calculation and reciprocity is out of place. Brothers practise a simple communism in respect of the small amounts of pocket-money which they receive from a father or elder brother. If a brother wants a shilling so that he can go to the coffee-shop, another brother will at once give it to him without question, or thought of repayment. Brothers [426] borrow goat-hair capes, shepherds' crooks, water-bottles and articles of clothing indiscriminately from one another without asking permission and without causing offence.

- 593 But it will not be imagined that the relations of brothers and sisters always proceed smoothly according to the preferred 554 pattern of solidarity based on mutual identification, understanding, and support. Precisely because siblings are conceived by one another and by outsiders as occupying in many respects similar status roles, their performances may be compared and evaluated, and the resulting rivalry may lead to envy, and at a further remove, to open enmity. The danger of such competition to the solidarity of the family is particularly acute in a community where social relations outside the family are largely regulated by the struggle for prestige. If a brother sees the possibility of winning the applause of outsiders, although it may be at his brother's expense, he may be very tempted to take the opportunity. The danger is greatest in situations where individual skills or qualities, for instance abilities as a shepherd or as a dancer, the proof of courage or the possession of a fine physique, may become the basis for judging differences between brothers. And outsiders delight in making and voicing such judgements because they appreciate the strains 578 they may cause. In other situations, there may be a desire to escape the effects of public disapproval for the action of a sibling even though this involves disloyalty. 'Hang my brother, I am too busy' (νεμώστε τὸν ἀδερφὸν μου, ἐγὼ δὲν ἀδελῶω) is a proverb which expresses this idea with a certain asstringency.

The effective sanction against such behaviour is simply the knowledge that while a quarrel between brothers which is not known and talked about outside the family generally allows

593 the child's first four years there is virtually a reversal of roles
 579 between mother and father. And this occurs precisely at the
 867 point in time when the child begins to play a representative
 624 role outside the family. The behaviour of the child now becomes
 a legitimate object for criticism by outsiders and the reputation
 of the whole group is at stake. Therefore the authority of the
 leader of the family is invoked to sanction the correct pattern
 of behaviour; pride, loyalty, and fearlessness in a boy, sexual
 modesty and obedience in a girl. But the father achieves this
 purpose more often by the withdrawal of his affection and the
 encouragement of feelings of shame, than by direct physical
 punishment.

593 During the period of adolescence (13-21 years of age
 882 approximately) the son or daughter must show a careful respect
 to the father and there is less familiarity. In the case of a
 daughter this is related to her sexual maturity and the need to
 discipline her actions; in the case of the son it prevents his
 premature self-assertion and protects the prestige of the father
 against the ridicule of outsiders. On the other hand, while a
 son's relations with his father are stable at this time, he goes
 through a period of some abruptness towards his mother in his
 efforts to prove his manliness.

593 As a son reaches the threshold of full manhood (23 years of
 884 age) the importance of his prestige ranking within the 'pallikari'
 [554] age group becomes incompatible with undue deference to any
 [561] senior person, even his father. This is reflected by an argu-
 mentative attitude in the private life of the family circle, and
 publicly by a measure of avoidance which makes it possible for
 a son not to show disrespect to his father without, however,
 showing positive deference. But this period of latent competition
 with the father, also, sees the son renewing a firm attachment
 to his mother.

593 After his retirement the opinion of the father counts for little
 888 except in questions concerning the marriages of his children and
 as a commentator on morality. Yet by identifying himself with
 his sons and daughters through an intense interest in his
 grandchildren he finds consolation.

593 On the other hand, the status of the mother (so long as she
 554 is not physically or mentally feeble) increases with age. As a
 888 mother of honourably married sons and daughters she has

190 THE FAMILY AS A CORPORATE GROUP

596 identification of their interests and affections are the members of the family that they cannot tolerate a permanent minority opinion. To dissent is a kind of treason. In a qualified sense, it may be said that authority over the affairs of the corporate family, in the later years of its existence, is corporately exercised. In practice, there are naturally many matters in which the head of the family through his experience in bargaining and negotiation has more expert judgement; and here the family will be guided by his recommendations. But, similarly, he in turn will take the advice of his sons or brothers when difficulties arise over the grazing and condition of the animals.

596 No outside person or group has the right to interfere in the
626 internal affairs of a family. The family has an unfettered jurisdiction over its own concerns. Public opinion exerts an immense moral pressure on a family, if the conduct of its members falls appreciably short of the ideals of family life; but it has no means of legitimately and forcibly restraining an unrepentant father or brother. One day, together with a Sarakatsan friend, I was
861 passing the home of a man from whose courtyard we heard a
626 confusion of shouts and cries. Looking carefully over the high wall, we saw the father lashing his thirteen-year-old daughter with a leather belt; it seemed that the girl's only fault was that she was too frail to lift and secure some heavy sacks on to a waiting mule. My friend's fury was evident. Sarakatsani cannot tolerate any form of cruelty to children. Yet he insisted that he could not interfere with the father's action even if he were on the point of killing her. But, lifting a heavy stone, he tossed it over the wall. The man, realizing that somebody had been watching him, at once ceased his blows on the child.

596 Within this autonomous family group there is a certain equivalence of rights and obligations between the members. It must be said, however, that this abstraction and separation of rights and obligations only emerges somewhat artificially in our analysis. Because of their very diffuseness it would not normally occur to an individual to balance his rights and privileges against those of another member of the family. There is no conscious accountancy in this solidarity. In general terms everybody has the right to expect material, moral and affective support from the family, as well as assistance in the event of physical assault. We have already stressed that a person will never admit

Zagori

THE SOLIDARITY OF THE FAMILY 197

It is, then, not inconsistent with these considerations that the 596
 Sarakatsani have no notions about the blood or spirit of an 577
 unavenged victim turning upon the kinsmen who have failed 627
 in their duties. For this would be an uncomfortable belief to 826
 accommodate where successful vengeance killing is contingent 761
 on a number of circumstances. This is interesting because, as
 we have already seen, blood is the material medium of kinship
 and its values. In other related contexts Sarakatsani clearly
 believe that blood has mysterious and intelligent powers. A
 horse standing outside a house when its master was murdered
 'dropped dead from the blood' (*ἐκασσε ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵμα*). A shep-
 herd who killed a woman 'was seized by the blood' (*τὸν ἐκασσε*
τὸ αἷμα). He was paralysed before his victim until the husband
 returned to kill him. For this was an evil and unnatural deed
 where supernatural sanctions rightly operated. Sarakatsani will
 even say that the avenging brother's blood gives him the
 courage to reclaim 'his own blood' from the killer. But sugges-
 tions that a dead man might be personally angry and dangerous
 if he is not avenged are met with amused and pragmatic dis-
 belief. If care is taken over a man's burial so that the Devil (195)
 cannot use him as a *βρυχάλας* (phantom), a dead man is
 simply dead. Vengeance, then, is a duty owed to the honour of
 the family and not to the memory of a particular individual.
 And honour depends on the strength, confidence, and self-
 regard of living men, not on any mysterious or spiritual powers.

The problems which the duty of vengeance killing presents 596
 to a family sometimes have an element of paradox. For in 577
 prosecuting vengeance and defending its honour a family 627
 almost inevitably deprives itself of one of its men. This may
 represent a dangerous weakening of its strength; and strength,
 it may be remembered, is the basis of honour. In the very act
 of defending one's honour one may in fact be jeopardizing it.
 The violator is always in mortal danger immediately after the
 deed, when grief and humiliation are fresh. But if he survives
 the first two years unscathed the victim's family begin to con-
 sider the situation in a more calculating and unemotional
 fashion. It then becomes a question rather of whether there are
 reasonable grounds, of the kind we have discussed, for 'not'
 prosecuting vengeance. This depends entirely on how the com- 627
 munity views their predicament. If all the brothers of the victim
 are married when the killer returns from prison, the consensus

596 of opinion is likely to be favourable to a policy of inaction but
 577 mutual avoidance. There is, inevitably, some loss of prestige
 627 but this may be the lesser of two evils. But mutual avoidance
 ● 626 (which is possible in this dispersed community) is essential. If
 [558] the killer were to appear before the victim's brothers on a public
 occasion, such as a wedding or a festival, the humiliating con-
 frontation would force the brothers to kill him or forfeit their
 honour. Generally, both sides have strong motives to keep out
 of each other's way. In the case of the vengeance killing between
 the Achnoulas and Stratos families, after some months the
 Stratos family may have felt relief that they did not know the
 identity of the killer. But the incident at the wedding was
 generally interpreted as a display of public boasting by George
 Achnoulas, and this made retaliation almost inevitable.

596 The loss of a life in a killing is seen as a loss of blood, and for
 577 this outrage the violator ought to pay with his own blood. We have
 627 shown that there is no passive solidarity in vengeance killing;
 a man does not generally suffer for a killing committed by his
 brother. This is a convention which plainly restricts the possible
 extensions of a vengeance killing and prevents a number of
 families from losing their 'protectors'. It is the analogue of those
 qualifications of active solidarity that we have already dis-
 cussed. However, this does not detract from the importance of
 active and passive solidarity in other situations nor the sig-
 nificance of the shedding of the common blood. This is very
 evident in fights which do not involve homicide.

596 An evenly contested fight in which no blood is spilled is an
 577 episode complete in itself; a fight of similar character and pro-
 598 portions in which one side physically loses blood but the other
 629 does not, inevitably provokes its own sequel in the attempt at
 some later time to draw blood from the opponent. But a man
 does not himself revenge the outrage which has been committed
 on him. This is the task of a brother or son. Also, the object of
 vengeance need not be the original opponent; any male
 member of this man's family is appropriate. In a typical dispute
 over the boundaries of grazing areas, Aristoteles was cut about
 the head by the other shepherd's crook. Some weeks later,
 Christos, the brother of Aristoteles, found himself at a wedding
 feast opposite the brother of the man who had recently quar-
 relled with his own brother. In his own words, 'I suddenly saw

200 THE FAMILY AS A CORPORATE GROUP

596 reinstated. And the father⁴ or brother who accomplishes this
 577 terrible work wins a grudging respect in the general community.
 627

596 Families do not always find at once the moral strength to
 577 take the only honourable action. In an affair between two
 627 second cousins in 1955 near a village on Mitsikeli, the girl's
 684 brothers first tried unsuccessfully to kill her lover. The girl then
 ran away to the man's home; no doubt as much through fear
 of her family as out of devotion to her lover. In another case,
 which occurred in 1944, the lover of an unmarried girl escaped
 from the neighbourhood after one unsuccessful attempt to shoot
 ● [62] him. Although the girl's association with the man had been
 notorious, no action was at first taken against her, but over a
 period of six months the family suffered acutely from public
 sneers and scorn until, quite suddenly, the girl disappeared.
 The nature of her fate was never satisfactorily explained.

The most recent instance of the vengeance of a family on a
 daughter occurred in 1948 when a Sarakatsanos wintering his
 sheep near the Gulf of Arta discovered that his daughter was
 conducting an affair with a villager, who had seduced her with
 false promises of marriage. At the time, there was no other
 Sarakatsan family in the immediate neighbourhood, so that
 there seemed to be some possibility of hushing up the matter;
 but the girl discovered that she was pregnant, and the man
 refused to marry her.⁵ The father took the girl to a secluded
 place, shot her with a pistol, and disposed of her body by rowing
 out into the gulf and sinking it with weights attached. Later, he
 killed the villager and dealt with his body in the same way. This
 case is often cited as the right solution to problems of this kind.

In cases where a girl is raped or a wife is similarly violated,
 or where at least the community accepts this presentation of
 the matter, the action is one of straightforward vengeance. The
 natural avenger is the brother for a sister and a husband for a
 wife. Such an attempt will certainly be made where an avenger
 is available, and it will be recalled that in the case of unmarried
 girls one of the brothers does not marry until all the sisters are

⁴ It seems to be the opinion that the father who begot the girl is a more
 appropriate executioner than the brother.

[59] ⁵ Marriage is not an honourable solution to a premarital affair unless,
 as is most unlikely, the liaison is known only to the two families, and not to
 the community.

THE SOLIDARITY OF THE FAMILY

201

established in marriage, an arrangement which expressly provides them with this avenger. Consequently, in cases where an act of vengeance concerns the sexual honour of a sister or a wife, there is little chance of it not being executed through default of a ready avenger. 596 577 627 627

A question of honour is also involved when a man breaks the contract of betrothal. The girl's brother ought to kill him. Here the attack on the girl and her family is not a physical assault upon her virginity, but the suggestion that in this or some other respect she is not worthy of marriage. And the knowledge that the breaking of the contract involves an obligation of vengeance only establishes more strongly in the minds of other members of the community the suspicion that there must exist some serious fault in the girl. I know of only two instances of broken betrothals over a period of ten years and significantly both these cases were arrangements between Sarakatsan girls and village men. Marriages between Sarakatsani are only arranged after exhaustive inquiry and considerable debate; mistakes are thus unlikely. In the first of these two cases, the former bridegroom fled to Athens after he had lost the top of a finger in an unsuccessful attempt on his life; in the second case, the father of the unhappy girl had no adult son, and was glad enough to have the additional excuse that the man lived some considerable distance away. He was loud in his threats, but in the event he did nothing; and people were quick to point out that this was exactly the kind of conduct one might have expected from this particular individual. 596 577 627 686

Between the two categories of 'affairs of honour' which I have described there is one important difference. In the first category, a killing demands a counter killing, and in theory, at least, this process may continue until all the adult male members of the two families have exterminated one another. The first killing which initiates the affair is not itself a random or indiscriminate act. It happens generally as the reply to an insult or as the consequence of a boundary dispute or some other quarrel. A man does not intend to kill in these situations, but accidents happen. The rough balance which in most cases, as we have seen, is struck between the two sides, satisfies neither group. The community remains relatively indifferent to questions of 'right' and gives its preference to the side which shows

the greater manliness.

202 THE FAMILY AS A CORPORATE GROUP

596 the greater manliness. In the second category, however, where
 577 an affair concerns the sexual honour of a woman, the community
 627 strongly upholds the 'right', in an ethical sense, of a family to
 684 kill a man who has assaulted one of its women. For this act is
 626 evil and dishonourable. An avenger in an affair of the second
 category does not generally go into exile, since his life is to a
 degree protected by public opinion. Where a balance is struck
 between the two groups in affairs of family honour, it is in-
 herently less stable in cases of the first category than in those of
 the second. And this appears in the fact that two families, be-
 tween whom there is a killing and an exile, are extremely care-
 ful to avoid meeting in circumstances where their presence may
 represent an affront to one another. Mutual avoidance is a
 means of preventing the disturbance of a precarious equili-
 brium. It appears, then, that the processes of vengeance pro-
 vide through exile a sanction against killing, and through
 vengeance killing a sanction against breaches of the code of
 sexual behaviour.

596 When a man is killed or a woman is assaulted something, a
 577 life or honour, is taken away, not merely from the violated
 627 individual, but more importantly from his family. One group
 has committed a wanton and hostile act upon the other, and
 between the two groups a debt of honour now exists. Something
 has been taken, something equivalent must be taken back.
 Until some kind of a balance is re-established, the victim's
 family is in the eyes of the community inferior to the group of
 the violator, even where the act of outrage, as in the case of
 sexual assault, is in itself evil.

It is a peculiarity of 'affairs of honour' that they consist of at
 least two events between which some interval of time elapses.
 The first is the violation of family honour which is generally an
 outrage on one particular member; the second is the act of
 vengeance which is similarly performed, in most cases, by one
 member only. In both instances the individual as victim or
 avenger represents his family. If the honour of the individual
 and the honour of the family are analytically separable, in
 action they are one. And if the execution of vengeance brings a
 measure of personal glory to the individual, at the same time
 it is also an act which is essentially altruistic.

577 The longer the interval of time between the two events the

SPIRITUAL KINSHIP

223

However, if two or three girls are born in succession, he may be asked to waive his right before the birth of the next child in case he is bringing bad luck by having an 'unlucky hand' (μακροχέρο χέρι).

A man may sometimes ask a father if he can baptize his child, and it is agreed that ideally this is the correct procedure. However, since the prospective godfather is more often a person of higher social status or prestige, it is generally the father of the child who takes the initiative in establishing the relationship. It is not easy for a person to refuse to 'baptize' a child, but a man who is forced somewhat unwillingly into the relationship does not generally become a useful or co-operative spiritual kinsman. Yet the advantages of the relationship do not all lie on the one side. A man who has 'baptized' many children has many clients who are in some measure morally bound to support him whether with votes, commercial custom, or in some other way. A man with many dependants wins prestige amongst his equals. And to stand as godfather is in itself a good thing, an action pleasing to God.

Considerably more than half the spiritual kinship relations of the Sarakatsani are with persons outside the community. The occupations of these persons are various. They include cheese merchants, animal dealers, village Presidents, members of village councils, village shopkeepers, other prominent villagers with influence, transport lorry owners, veterinary experts, lawyers, Members of Parliament, grammar school teachers, tailors, and others. They have one quality in common that they all are able in different ways to help or hinder the families who wish to establish a link of spiritual kinship with them.

Spiritual kinship is not the only means of introducing an element of moral commitment into a relationship with a person outside the community, but it is the most effective. The ritual sanction 'locks' the relationship. An accusation of ingratitude may easily break well established relations of friendship of the kind that are based on the exchange of complementary favours, but it cannot destroy a connexion of spiritual kinship, nor is it a justification for retaliation against the other partner whatever the provocation. Although there are godparents who do not alter their course of conduct after entering the relationship, this is rare. Public opinion and a man's religious and social conscience put some restraint on him. Naturally, merchants and

THE HONOURABLE MAN: NEGATIVE RESTRICTIONS 291

The attribution of envy often rests on valid grounds, for such women come, in the main, from families of low prestige and little material prosperity where difficulties in arranging honourable marriages are almost inevitable.

This completes the description of ideal types. Men and women struggle to identify themselves with the ideal type personality that is appropriate to their sex and time of life. And if a man lives in conformity with these normative expectations of social conduct, he is described as *τιμιος*, honourable. Clearly *τιμιος*, honourable, is a word with considerably wider reference and less specificity than *τιμη*, honour, since it covers a range of qualities whose applicability is relative to the age and sex of the person described as honourable; while, on the other hand, the values associated with *τιμη* remain always unchanged. If the head of a family fails to avenge the breaking of his daughter's betrothal because there is no adult son, it may be argued that as an 'honourable' man his inaction is due to his concern to protect his family. But if circumstances of age and family commitments excuse to a degree the loss of honour, nevertheless honour is lost. Opposition of the two concepts 'honour' and 'honourable' is not frequent but, when it does occur, the former is always the significant standard where prestige is concerned.

4. THE HONOURABLE MAN:
NEGATIVE RESTRICTIONS

If the man who is *τιμιος*, honourable, must attempt to achieve a pattern of ideal conduct, there are also certain negative restrictions on action which he must accept. That these restrictions concern, in almost every case, conduct that wantonly threatens the integrity of the family life is not remarkable when we remember on the one hand the spiritual and material significance of the Sarakatsan family group, and on the other the distrust, hostility, and competition which mark the relations between families that are not related through kinship or marriage.

Scandal which falsely questions the virtue of a maiden is believed to be particularly wicked. It may be easily achieved by only a few allusive remarks, whose author probably succeeds in remaining anonymous. For this reason, perhaps, it is strongly believed that God will punish those who spread lying scandals.

THE HONOURABLE MAN: NEGATIVE RESTRICTIONS 293

or hut. It is, nevertheless, true that people are insatiably curious about the details of domestic life and relations in other families. The condemnation of eavesdropping, although ideally it points to the recognition of the right of family privacy, in practice merely places a negative sanction on one particularly blatant method of obtaining information about other people's affairs.

Men are not honourable who, possessing great physical strength, use it to tyrannize others. They are men who without cause or restraint attack others with insults, using their mothers' or sisters' names in offensive sexual contexts or uttering other provocative blasphemies. Such a man, it is believed, purposely stages an incident to humiliate another who must either lose honour by not responding, or suffer a physical beating. It is accepted that, in most instances, to insult another is neither avoidable nor dishonourable. A sheep strays across a boundary, another shepherd stones it, its owner insults him, blows are exchanged. This sequence of events is to be expected in a community where the interests of different families conflict and each man must maintain his self-regard and the honour of the family. But wanton and unprovoked outrage is evil.

There are, also, categories of persons whom it is always dishonourable for a man to assault: women, old men, young boys, and children, persons weaker than himself. A man who interferes with women, or picks a quarrel with an old man or a young boy, quickly loses his social reputation. It sometimes occurs that, when grazing land is disputed, a family will send its sheep under the guard of a young shepherd boy into the disputed area, knowing that the other shepherd will not improve his case with the community, the villagers, or the police, if he strikes the youth. However, this is a dangerous tactic since, if the young shepherd is struck, honour demands retaliation.

There is one other category of persons that a man must not exploit, the very poor. Whereas a Sarakatsanos will not hesitate to trick or deceive other men, it is not honourable to take advantage of a very poor man with only twenty or thirty animals, particularly if he has a young family. It is the very fact of his dependence on the generosity and forbearance of those of greater power and prestige that morally prevents them from exploiting him. In the face of the implicit admission of his failure in life they cannot press home their advantage. Since

294 THE HONOURABLE MAN: NEGATIVE RESTRICTIONS

577
135 he has failed to provide adequately for his children, others must assume a responsibility not to make their humiliating condition worse. If men oppress the very poor of their own community, there is an element of hubris in their conduct that respects neither God nor the family which is His institution.

577
576 In general, where the interests and honour of a family are not affected, every effort ought to be made to avoid giving needless affronts to others. When people pass in hailing distance, conventional greetings must be carefully exchanged. When he is asked for some information which he does not wish to give, or when he is requested to do something which he does not wish to do, a man ought not to reply with a curt negative; rather he should answer in the one case with polite and elaborate evasions, and in the other with a declaration of his willingness to help, balanced by a list of insurmountable difficulties which, nevertheless, he will struggle to overcome. Within the limit of his pride a man ought always to appear sociable and concerned. These prescriptions are not entirely prudential.

[828] There is a consciousness of common humanity. Competitive hostilities prevent men from expressing this feeling except in the marginal areas of social life; but to ignore it entirely is not only socially dangerous, but it denies the essential nobility and generosity of man and provokes the anger of God.

577
626 The community, then, places certain bounds on the expression of hostility. They are not very onerous limitations, but clearly there may often exist doubt, in the evaluation of a man's conduct, as to whether he has overstepped the limit of permissible hostility and, thus, has lost his reputation for acting as an honourable man. Inevitably the duty to further family interests, and the limitation on the expression of hostility, conflict in certain circumstances.

156
577
829 Ideally, it is maintained, a man ought to go beyond the negative prescriptions contained in the notion of the honourable man; he ought also to be positively concerned about the interests and honour of an unrelated man, he ought to be φιλικός, caring for, or loving, his honour. That is to say he ought to be so intensely concerned about the nobility of his own conduct that he takes into account how his actions affect the honour and prestige of others. It is still an essentially self-regarding attitude, but the acute concern about the purity of

156
577
828
591 assume, ideally, a community in which all families are equal in their possession of honour, and all men are equal in the honourable discharge of the duties associated with their social roles. Although a Sarakatsanos seldom explicitly attributes prestige to another, and struggles always to find some failings in another's character when he discusses him, yet by the recognition that he gives another in public life, by the way he shares conversation and drinking companionship, he may implicitly admit him to a position of equality. A man may also talk or drink with a person he considers to be of inferior prestige, but there are fine nuances of attitude which make this difference between them very clear. If this evaluation of prestige is acceptable to the general community the man who is treated as an inferior will receive no public backing if he chooses to interpret this treatment as a slight, and reacts to it violently.

156 The flagrant breaking of social norms leads to the withdrawal
577 of recognition and response, that is to a definitive loss of prestige. After it became known that Goulas had falsely denigrated
828 the daughter of George Carvounis he appeared even more
558 infrequently in public, an admission of his shame and humiliation. When he did enter the coffee-shop people greeted him unenthusiastically, if an exchange of greetings was unavoidable; but nobody engaged him in conversation, or bought him a drink. His presence was tolerated, but he was tacitly expelled from the intimacies of social life. He was no longer an equal in honour.

156 Conformity is the chief defence against denigration where
577 people believe that the hostile criticism of others protects in
626 some way their own reputation. Moreover the precision of this criticism is considerable since the social roles which a man or woman assumes at any period of life are few in number, and their implications are perfectly understood both by the protagonists and those who observe them. Yet it would be too simple a judgement to think that the concepts of honour and the honourable man depend only on the external sanctions of competition or mutual hostility. For the Sarakatsani believe that these ideals and values, which breathe meaning, purpose, and value into their lives, require no justification or sanction. They are a way of life, not a code of interdictions.

577 But even social conformity does not necessarily protect

59 always known in the neighbourhood when a family has had
 554 guests (μουσαφιηδες); their quality, relationship, and the
 556 possible reasons for their visit are debated in detail by the other
 574 families. Comment is often caustic, but the very interest which
 is aroused is a recognition of the importance of the event. If
 a family of numbers and wealth entertains a patron from the
 town, this is a triumph which it enjoys to the full. Meat is
 killed and wine is bought. Largesse is demanded of the family
 which entertains many guests. And in some mysterious way
 [26] neighbouring families discover the measure of generosity, or
 meanness, which a host has shown to his visitors; and criticism,
 encouraged by envy, will not spare him. In hospitality
 (φιλοξενία), a virtue in which the Sarakatsani believe they are
 naturally pre-eminent, there is always a strong element of
 competition.

554 (c) LINEAGE*

611 Νταμάρι, lineage, refers to the quality of the kindred relation-
 612 ships which a man inherits from both his father and mother;
 and the importance of this for prestige has already been dis-
 [55] cussed in chapter three. If he possesses the surname of one of
 the leading families, or is directly descended, preferably in the
 male line, from a famous tselingas of the last century, this also
 is a significant element in a man's reputation. It might appear
 to indicate that for the highest and the lowest families, at least,
 reputation of lineage is patrilineally inherited. There is, indeed,
 a bias in favour of relationships traced through the father
 (particularly agnatic relationships) in the evaluation of νταμάρι
 in all families, and this is certainly accentuated at either
 extreme of the hierarchy of prestige, where certain family
 names are associated with the idea of high or low reputation,
 but the inheritance of νταμάρι remains fundamentally bilateral.
 [58] In general, as we shall see in a discussion of marriage, men are
 [55] careful to marry their sons or daughters into families of equal
 [626] reputation. Where a member of a leading family takes a bride
 [558] of markedly lower lineage, the community withdraws from the
 new family the recognition of the prestige associated with the
 husband's surname by the simple procedure of refusing to call

* Lineage, here, does not, of course, refer to a unilineal descent group
 but to the quality of pedigree through all lines of descent.

THE MATERIAL ELEMENTS IN PRESTIGE 301

him by this name, and substituting some nickname, or patronymic.

But the prestige of lineage depends itself on the attributes of wealth and numbers which have already been examined. It does not help a poor man to claim that his great-grandfather was a famous tselingas with two thousand sheep. It is true that a father, or grandfather, who had the necessary wealth to support the nobility of his line is a saving grace for those who have lost their flocks, but it is a small one. The children of a leading family whose wealth has vanished suffer the same fate as the children of a family whose father, although from a family of the 'first lineage', has married beneath himself, that is they literally 'lose' their name, the surname of the father. Lineage refers to prestige in the past, while the essence of competition in this community is concerned with influence in the present. Therefore, a 'name', without the means to support it, is not recognized.

This, in practice, is the mechanism that restricts the number of families that can successfully claim to be of 'first lineage'. Not all the collateral relatives of a leading family are recognized as equivalent in prestige, for without numbers and wealth they cannot aspire to this. And it is inherently unlikely that they will all possess these advantages. There are two important limiting factors. With the rule of equal inheritance between brothers, the size of the group of brothers which is necessary to build and protect wealth and prestige, itself is the cause, in the next generation, of the fragmentation of this wealth. The second factor is disease. Twenty years ago sheep-pox, and today liver-fluke, are diseases capable of decimating a flock within a short time. However honourable a man, the loss of his flocks must diminish his own prestige to some degree, and that of his children more seriously.

(D) MARRIAGES

Τὸ συγγενεσμός is the affinal relationship between two previously unrelated families. It is in the early days of summer that the families of men who wish to take wives in the following year begin to consider the question of finding suitable affines and, during these weeks, the gossip of the community is much concerned with news and speculation about matchmaking.

156 in the eyes of others, and how their evaluation of himself relates to the ideal image of how he would wish to appear. Clearly, the more the publicity that surrounds any particular area of social life, the greater is the efficacy of the sentiment of self-regard as a sanction of approved qualities and conduct.

156 A man's self-regard is typically molested where he is
577 insulted or defamed or believes himself to be so treated. When
578 another person suggests by even indirect allusion that a man is dishonourable or weak he molests his self-regard (προσβάλλει τὸν ἑγωτάμῳ του). Or when a man by deed, or word, behaves towards another in such a way as to suggest that he is not worthy of consideration and recognition, he again molests his self-regard; for a man only acts in this way towards another when he considers him to be of lesser reputation and, by inference, less honourable. In such circumstances the core of a man's social personality is touched, his manliness and prepotence are questioned. Then, the only remedy is to attack his detractors with knife or stick.

There are many instances of such a situation. The stoning of a sheep by another shepherd when it has strayed across a boundary. An unguarded public remark which the recipient judges others will consider to be an unanswered insult if he does not retaliate. It is, in part, self-regard which urges the abduction of a girl when a candidate bridegroom has been refused by the girl's father. Christos Kazoukas was refused the hand of the daughter of Paschos. She was too young, the girl's father said, and as she was, indeed, only twenty-two, Christos was prepared to accept this explanation rather than undertake the dangerous business of abduction. But George Carvounis, a second cousin to Christos, heard a different tale that the girl's family had refused Christos because it was said that he was sexually impotent and inadequate. In fact, the girl's mother had dubbed him by a nickname, 'Lame penis' (χουτσουρούτσου), which referred literally to these supposed short-comings. Christos had a smooth skin, fine features and a strikingly high-pitched voice. Simply, he did not look the part of a pallikari. There was, therefore, all the greater urgency that he should reply to these damning allegations; for the alternative was ridicule and shame. His kinsmen offered united moral support and the unspoken threat of abandonment if

he did nothing.

312

THE VALUES OF PRESTIGE

156 women do not go
 159 out into the world and compete with one another. On the
 562 contrary, their activities centre round the hearth where they
 [602] ought to co-operate with their kinswomen and, if they are
 married, with their sisters-in-law and the wives of the husband's
 brothers. When a woman is said to have self-regard, this
 generally refers to a touchy and unco-operative attitude with
 other women in the extended family or co-operating group;
 it is, then, not a quality for self-congratulation.

156 Conversely, where shame is the fear of failure or criticism
 562 that demands a careful modest constrained demeanour, it is
 [831] said that women have more shame than men. The Sarakatsani
 point out that since it is the sexuality of women which provokes
 men and not the reverse, women have the greater need to be
 constantly restrained in their thoughts and actions by a sense
 of sexual shame. Furthermore, since men must battle with one
 another in the community and show craftiness in their dealings
 with prominent and useful people outside its boundaries, it is
 clear that the restrictive régime, which an extreme sense of
 shame imposes on an individual, is incompatible with the
 social role of the head of family who must generally assert
 himself and on occasion for the sake of his family may even be
 forced into questionable actions. This is not to say that a man
 does not equally feel shame when he is judged to have failed.
 It means, rather, that unlike a woman he cannot remain always
 in a state of shame, in the sense of guarding against imminent
 failure by a careful restriction of behaviour and movement.

* * *

156

626

The fear of gossip and ridicule is closely related to the two
 concepts of self-regard and shame. The prestige of an individual,
 or a family, is constantly being evaluated and re-evaluated in
 the community through gossip about personalities and events.
 To be gossiped about is in most cases to be criticized adversely,
 and since people enjoy this recreation they laugh at and ridicule
 the object of their discussion. The knowledge, or the imagining,
 of this ridicule and laughter is an important element in a man's
 feelings of shame. For if the outside world judges him to be a
 failure he has also failed to live up to his own ideal image of
 himself which depends on success.

THE SANCTIONS OF PRESTIGE VALUES 313

The laughter of other people is invited in all situations where a man, or a group, has failed. 'The world laughs' (ὁ κόσμος γέλει) at a man when he fails to defend his honour; for instance, when he does not reply to an affront. Equally, it laughs at him when he makes some slip in conventional behaviour, or when he is made to look ridiculous. It laughs at him if he does not adequately fulfil his social role. Conversely, the need to conform to social morality and etiquette is often supported by the statement that, if a man does not act in a particular way, 'the world will laugh at him'. To be ridiculous (γελοῖος) is to lack the recognition essential for social reputation.

The ridicule or laughter which a man suffers, or imagines he is suffering, is seldom crudely inflicted to his face. The sanction is more subtle. But he is not slow to sense that he is being ridiculed. A man who is insensitive to the attitudes of others (and among the Sarakatsani such men are rare) will speedily be informed of the situation through some kinsman who, because of their association, is anxious that the ridiculed man should reassert his position, if that is possible, or, in a case of moral delinquency, should mend his ways.

There are, however, certain situations where open ridicule may occur. A man of very low prestige who is 'lost' may sometimes be ridiculed to his face. On the rare occasions when Costas Pistiolis is in any social gathering he is invariably asked to sing, since this ability is one of the many social graces he does not possess. Everybody laughs. Mild as such mockery may seem, no honourable member of this community would accept it passively. Open ridicule may also happen at weddings when men lose their sense of caution. At one wedding a guest who was addled and aggressive from his drinking called for more ouzo. A bottle was brought to him. He poured a glass and drank it, only to discover it was water. A roar of laughter went up, a pointed comment on the weakness of a man unable to drink and retain a measure of self-control. At once his knife was out, but it was quickly wrenched from his hand and the man was thrown bodily from the arbour.

Although the community is dispersed, news travels with rapidity. Any interesting event is widely known throughout the community within two or three days. Weddings and festivals are centres of news exchange, but heads of families, and some

- 203 older women, are constantly in Jannina for business and
 626 shopping. Here, most Sarakatsani eat and sleep at the Korakas
 [193] Hotel and this establishment is an important clearing-house
 for business and gossip. The eagerness for news and gossip is
 intense. The consciousness of being a community stimulates the
 circulation of news which is all the more urgent because people
 do not live in a closely settled community. In its turn the very
 process of evaluating the conduct of other Sarakatsani is a
 reaffirmation of the solidarity and indeed of the existence of
 [1123] the community as such. Gossip and denigration are carried
 out in terms of a system of values. Every criticism of a man's
 conduct, whether it is justified or not, is a restatement of a value.
- 626 Gossip within the family is uninhibited and subjective.
 Fantastic allegations of wrongdoing are levelled against other
 families of the community on negligible evidence. No doubt
 this contributes to the group's morale and suggests, by contrast,
 its own integrity. Public discussion of a man's conduct, for
 instance in a coffee-shop, is more careful and somewhat more
 [603] factual. Vicious slander without a foundation of hearsay fact
 merely destroys the accuser's own reputation for being an
 honourable man. Slander of this kind might be an answerable
 provocation if any kinsman of the ridiculed man were present
 at the time. If there is some, but not conclusive, evidence to
 condemn a man, a spirited debate will take place and it is in
 these circumstances that the presence of an articulate kinsman
 may help to salvage a man's reputation. But where a man's
 fault or failure seems to be clearly established the whole
 assembly will unite with obvious pleasure to ridicule a man.
 In this way they emphasize their own probity and prestige.
 Then, even the presence of kinsmen will not save a man, and
 if his shortcomings are sufficiently serious they may be driven
 to abandon him.
- 626 Gossip never ceases and it seizes on the pettiest of details and
 533 circumstances. In situations which especially shock or pique the
 community's imagination satirical songs are sometimes written.
 Song writing, of course, is the work of individuals but it de-
 pends on the community whether the songs will be accepted
 and remembered. This is a most feared sanction since the
 ridicule lives on in the song. The song will not be sung to the
 victim's face, but he will learn of it, and be bitterly shamed.

THE SANCTIONS OF PRESTIGE VALUES 315

The songs are not, in fact, particularly daring or insulting in themselves: therein, perhaps, lies their effect. Of Nasios Karapheris the woman chaser it is sung, 'Up at Kouphos where they used to grow corn, Nasios is making a place to lie down. Hidden away in the long grasses, he makes secret eyes. Mitsos draws out his knife to kill Nasios Karapheris.' 626 533

A song may be composed about a man who, although he has not erred morally, has been made to look ridiculous. For this, too, is failure. Theodoros Kallis is a physically strong man with a bullying character. He is wealthy and many people fear his violent nature. They were not sorry, therefore, when he suffered the following misfortune.

'On the twenty-first of January went Theodoros, the poor devil, to see his little mother-in-law. But when he arose in the morning, "Oh dear oh dear, they have cut the tail of my horse, dear mother-in-law!" Then cursed the mother-in-law, "May two unmarried boys never live to set up their wedding standards!"'

A man's failure in any respect may also be prolonged in the community's memory by giving him a nickname (παρετσούδι). Flattering nicknames are sometimes given to members of the leading families. Costas Katsanos in his younger days was known as 'the flyer' (φύγας) because of his great speed of movement up or down hill. But more often nicknames ridicule a man. Thus a man who was caught in the act of stealing maize from a villager's garden, was named καλαμπόκιος, an adjective fabricated from the Greek word for this grain. The name was not a comment on the morality of theft but the indignity of discovery and failure. 626 551

I have said enough to indicate how public opinion functions through gossip and ridicule acts to sanction the community's prestige values. Gossip and its outcome, ridicule, are in a certain manner the external sanctions which support the internal sanctions of individual action, self-regard and the sense of shame. The subtlety of gossip and ridicule as sanctions is that, since they do not generally operate in his presence, they offer a man no excuse for violent response. He may respond to the insult of an individual, but not to the laughter of the community which he senses, but seldom hears. 626

/167 cont./

594 mention--except for the choice of husband for one of the offspring and
593 the right of economic control--all the acts relevant to the "family spirit" that are inherent in it, personal relations between parents and children, brothers and sisters, etc.

596 /168/ All these examples emanate from actual family life, but by comparison with the sphere controlled by the framework embracing the extended family, one sees that this is very little.

596 When one of its elements, a single family or individual, tries to
598 act independently in one of the sectors other than those we have enumerated, they find themselves faced with a conflict between individuals, between groups, or between an individual and a group, a conflict which sooner or later ends in a split.

596 However, this is not the moment to speak of that; nor is this the
● 524 moment to examine how the extended family ordinarily protects itself against this type of crisis, thanks among other factors to the dynamism of the phenomena of obligation-compensation which develops in its midst and also thanks to the mechanism of social control which is peculiar to it. We shall content ourselves for now in describing only these two
[128] means of defence (the second in a special section), thus preparing the ground for our final chapter.

* * * *

594 In point of fact, the conjugal families transfer their rights to
596 the extended family. The effectiveness of the system, shown throughout the preceding analyses, constitutes their compensation. The head-manager, to whom his subjects have transferred their rights, enjoys the dignity and privileges of headman and the unquestionable recognition of his talents.

Although they have transferred their economic responsibilities to the head-manager, the heads of conjugal families are, in return, relieved of much worry; they represent productive forces in the family economy and possess the right to censure the headman; masters in their own

594 /168 cont./

596 family, they can, should the case arise, withdraw from the extended family.

596 Though the women have transferred their independence, their initiative and the free disposal of themselves to the men, their female responsibilities in common economic activities and in magico-religious manifestations, their role in the succession and in the creation of alliances give them considerable satisfactions.

The same is true of the hierarchy within their group and the resulting transfer /of rights and privileges/: first, all the women to the wife of the head, the wives to their mothers-in-law, the recently married women to their sisters-in-law married before them, /169/ and so on, /transfers/ which are compensated for by their authority over the women and children in their own family, by the hope of one day becoming wives or heads, mothers-in-law or older sisters-in-law, and thus exerting in the future a sort of sovereignty over other women.

Social Functions and Social Control of the Extended Family.

596

The entire analysis of the way of life of the extended family clearly shows that this group is an omni-functional group in the sense that the Sarakatsani expects from it the gratification of all his needs, both material and moral. The Tséligato is a supra-functional group.

596
1974

But its functions imitate those of the extended family in a great many respects. If it is, in certain respects, more efficient than the latter, this is due to the fact that it has at its disposal a larger number of means of action. However, from the functional point of view, the priority over all the Sarakatsani groups belongs indisputably to the extended family. The proof resides in the established fact that neither the conjugal family nor the Tséligato can dispense with it, whereas it can carry on its life outside the Tséligato.

(594)

596
626

We have not dwelt upon the concrete functions of the extended family, for we have treated them all in connection with its life except one that we have not examined sufficiently: this is the social control (39)

/169 cont./

exercised by the family.

39. On the idea of social control: E.A. Ross: A Survey of the Foundations of Order /cited in English/; R.E. Park and E. W. Burgess: Introduction to the Science of Sociology /cited in English/, L.L. Bernard: Social Control in its Sociological Aspects /cited in English/; H.M. Johnson: Sociology, etc. See also the systematic and critical exposition by G. Gurvitch: "Le contrôle social" in: Sociologie au XX^e siècle, Vol. I.

There is no doubt that the Sarakatsani are committed to the strict preservation of their way of life, as we shall see later on and in our final chapter. What is important to note here is that their society, in order to protect itself from possible changes, moves along two courses which converge: it defends at any price the integrity of its cultural armature and it obliges its members to conform to the traditional norms and models of behavior, both for individuals and for the group. That this conformity leads to the preservation of the cultural armature which in turn gives meaning to conformity is obvious.

/170/Now in practice it is the extended family that finds itself charged with this mission, first of all through the education of the children. It molds their moral and psychological personalities according to the ideas and values peculiar to it.

Secondly, /it carries out this mission/ by the direct and tight control of the life of all its members. Its way of life, living together, the community, the collectivity, represent means highly efficient in this regard. No one can escape them. This control goes very far. It reaches even areas which, by definition, ought to enjoy a certain independence, indeed a profound spontaneity, as for example, maternal or filial affection, the joy born of a festival, or the sadness of mourning. In all these instances neither an individual nor the group

/170 cont./

596
622 may express sentiments that they really feel, but those "that should be felt," expressed in a manner "allowed" by traditional prescription.
[589] Though the study of marriage has already furnished us with some examples
[593] (for instance, the "dialogues" between the mother and daughter at the moment of separation, spoken by the chorus of assistants), the study of mourning, of laments, of art, will offer us others.

Finally, /it does so/ by the application of the rules of justice and morality with which it is entrusted and of which we shall not speak for the moment in order not to anticipate.

That each social group exerts its "control" over component members, sub-groups or individuals, is a well-known phenomenon. If we have wished to throw into special relief the social control exercised by the extended family it is because the latter is the principal carrier of Sarakatsani life, therefore the repository of their culture which justifies its elevation to the rank of "guardian of the past--guarantor or the future."

596
613 The Character of the Extended Family.

The extended family is not an "undivided family." The latter actually includes at one and the same time all the descendants and all the lineages, agnatic as well as uterine, joining them together into an egalitarian community. (40)

[113] 40. See G. Davy: Sociologues d'hier et d'aujourd'hui, part 2, La famille et la parenté d'après Durkheim, p. 109.
596 Nor is it a "great family" like the "joint /171/ family" /cited in
191 English/ or the Kharouba Kabyle" (41)

[113] 41. See M. Mauss: Manuel d'Ethnographie, p. 135-136;
Chandrasekhar: The Hindu "joint family" /cited in English/ in the journal Social Forces /cited in Engl./, XXI, 1943, p. 327 f.; Maunier, R.: Mélanges de Sociologie Africaine, p. 65 f.

/211 cont./

121 make sure it is fulfilled; men are always men and automatic obedience or
696 a promise would mean nothing if carrying it out were entrusted only to
692 the good will of those concerned.
629

On this point our discussions with our informants are very revealing.
696 We were told that if the person recalcitrant to the arbiters' sentence
692 is a member of a Tséligato, no other Tséligato would ever accept his
629 cooperation. If he is a Tséligas, he would immediately be abandoned by
626 all the participants and labelled "destroyer of sheepfolds" (Chalassostanis)
(686) --a name used to stigmatize a disloyal or incapable head.
(499)

The consequences of such a reaction are obvious. The one who is socially isolated, rejected by his own people, can expect only social degradation, economic ruin, exile into surrounding society. This last is his only refuge. But, since, the exiled one is not adapted to the latter he will see his condition worsen from day to day. Actually, this is enough to frighten the most courageous or the most refractory.

However, relying a little more on facts, we see that the recalcitrant one can hope for two things:

/212/ First, since he is a nomad, he can move far away from the place of arbitration and seek a setting where his behavior is not known, and be accepted there.

Second, assuming that someday his new Tséligato is informed of his conduct, there is a good chance that meanwhile he has been able to develop sufficiently close and honorable relationships with the "others" so that his unfortunate past will no longer be taken into consideration. Moreover, the absence of his adversaries permits him to give his own version of events in order to justify himself.

Now it is obvious that between the possibility of the application of envisioned punishment (which is relative) and an obedience to arbiters which is absolute (the person concerned "does not even think of disobeying") there is a discrepancy. It is difficult for us to assume that a "relative" conditioning can determine absolute effects. This shows that, in the

616 /212 cont./

617 process of obeying, other factors intervene, and that we must discover them
618 in analyzing this phenomenon in its totality, true to the heritage of M.
626 Mauss. (27)

27. See M. Mauss: Essai sur le don, p. 275-276.--

[17]
[114]
It is noteworthy that Malinowski, *ibid.*, pp. 39, 41, 42, in his effort to explain the obedience of the Trobrianders to their legal customs, gives an interpretation identical to ours concerning obedience to arbiters, based on his famous "principle of reciprocity." We have explained above that this principle does not cover all of the life of law. And we shall give a more detailed critique of Malinowski's theory in one of the following sections. If we find his positions deficient it is because they are formulated according to his functionalist method which seems to us inadequate, in keeping with C. Lévi-Strauss: Introduction, p. xxxvi, who says: "Where Mauss saw a constant relationship between the phenomena as their explanation, Malinowski asks himself what they are for in order to seek a justification for them."

692 Every altercation between individuals is translated in actual fact into

627 an opposition between groups. The members of the family of each

596 interested party, bound to him by solidarity and alliance, will follow

598 him all the more readily when disputes submitted to arbiters are of an

economic order, hence handled by the head. If portions of families are

(494) set against each other in the core of the extended family or the Tséligato

these groups run the danger of splitting. The principle of cooperation

and solidarity is then challenged. And where, until then, peace reigned,

there is threat of disorder and insecurity. Besides, the principle of

the isolation of Sarakatsani from surrounding society is also endangered.

(648) For if the recalcitrant refuses to obey the arbiters, the only recourse

to justice is the state, which means interference of non-Sarakatsani

000 (formerly the occupying forces) in Sarakatsani affairs. Finally, the

629 /213/ Finally, the
692 /213/ disobedience of arbiters means a disobedience of the custom
183 which prescribes it. Since each partial custom is organically linked
182 to all the others, the entire traditional cultural edifice begins to
696 crumble.

These few consequences of disobedience to arbiters represent for the Sarakatsani a number of serious dangers. In order to avoid them it seems to us that a whole complex of reactions, influences and pressures arising from all the social forces which are affronted are set in motion for this purpose.

629 Under strong motivation which, in the end, is ascribable to their
692 concern for the protection of all that is original, characteristic and
626 essential to Sarakatsani life, individuals, sub-groups and groups,
696 plunged into anxiety and distress, turn against the potential or actual recalcitrant, and by word, gesture and sign language, explicitly or implicitly leave him scarcely any choice. Before going on to the ultimate remedy of isolation, they will bear down on him with all their might to avoid creating explosive and disastrous situations.

The recalcitrant one, in turn, is more or less aware of the pressure put upon him. His conscience has already been aroused; he is intuitive rather than reflective and extremely participative because of his firm integration in his traditional milieu. (28)

28. Margaret Mead: Cooperation and competition/cited in English/, p. 461.

(155) Moreover, his personality, molded by education which has inculcated in him respect for tradition and has developed in him the moral qualities and intellectual habits that his society demands, is definitely sensitive to influences and pressures from his associates. He therefore feels responsible for the disturbance his conduct has caused; he is well aware that everybody is waiting for him to follow the path marked out by tradition; he knows that all eyes are fixed on him; he is steeped in this suffocating atmosphere and gives way under its weight.

/213 cont./

629 Two points of view converge: microsociological and macrosociological
629 influences and pressures, on the one hand; a molding of the personality,
629 on the other. It is this double determinancy, "the internal and external
629 causality" in the apt phrase of R. Bastide, (29) that is at the base of
29. R. Bastide: La causalité externe and la causalité
interne, vol. XXI, C.I.d.S., pp. 77-79.

the phenomena of obedience to arbiters, which would otherwise be inexplicable.

/214/ It matters little whether this drama is explicit or implicit, conscious or unconscious. The important fact is that it exists and is effective, as is shown by the infinitesimal number of cases of isolation. (30)

(113)

30. All these methodological as well as ontological statements are drawn from the present state of research in the social sciences, which has led G. Gurvitch to speak of "total psychological phenomena" (Traité, vol. II, pp. 333-338). Unfortunately this concept is still insufficiently developed; it is drawn from many different works among which we cite the following: M. Dufrenne: La personnalité de base.--R. Bastide: Sociologie et Psychoanalyse.--C. Lévi-Strauss: Anthropologie Structurale.--H. Wallon: Les origines du caractère chez l'enfant.--R. Benedict: Echantillons de civilisations.--R. Linton: The Science of man /cited in English/ and Les fondements culturels de la personnalité.--A. Kardiner: The individual and his society /cited in English/.--T. M. Newcomb: Social Psychology /cited in English/.--O. Klineberg: Psychologie sociale.--A. Kroeber: Anthropology today /cited in English/.--G. Gillin: For a science of social man /cited in English/, etc.

.....

626 But before we proceed further, certain questions arise: this
629 mechanism of imposing certain rules of behavior, in what way does it
629

/214 cont./

626 differ from what we call "sanctions of ethnic opinion or simple dis-
627 paragement?" (31)
692

31. In the words of P. Fauconnet: La responsabilité, p. 12.

Why should we accept the fact that this same mechanism derives from law and not from the mechanism of enforcement common to all social regulations?

The reply to these two questions is the same. It is the absence of any possibility of escape, the need for all individuals to conform absolutely, the strictness of obligation which differentiates the facts described from all other kinds of sanctions. There is also the nature of the "authority" which underlies these rules and which is clearly distinguished from that of other regulations.

* * * *

629 Recourse to arbitration is infrequent. This does not mean that
692 disputes do not arise, but merely that in addition to arbitration there are other procedures leading to their settlement. These are adjudication by the family, the Tseligato and Sarakatsani society, of which we have spoken briefly when pointing out that these entities have a voice in the disputes.

Now their comments in cases of conflict may, in a way, take on the force of law and commit the persons concerned to follow a definite conduct which represents the solution of the conflict.

/215/ Their means of action are the same as those that give sanction to the decision of arbiters. However, although in the latter case the groups act in support of an arbitrated sentence, when they give their opinion they are acting on their own account.

181 That is not all. The observer of Sarakatsani life is often struck
691 by the conformism of our herders. They follow, or at any rate they seem
182 to follow, to the letter, all the regulations derived from their law--
which brings us back to the statements of Rivers and Hartland cited above.
This fact is very significant. For it shows another legal function of the

/216 cont./

627 decided upon and carried out by individuals. They are variants of the
686 major sanction, namely social isolation, the nature and importance of
689 which we have pointed out. With respect to the removal of the head,
we have nothing to say since the facts speak for themselves.

After this general survey we may conclude:

629 First, that it is certain that arbiters, groups and individuals
692 determined by circumstances or by a regulation, actually perform the
182 legal functions set forth at the beginning. They enforce and demand
626 respect for the order dictated by the customs and general ideas of
their society. The first two /arbiters and groups/ do so by relying on
the group and its dynamics; the individuals close /by means of/ their
own specific functions recognized by the group and supported by it when
they fulfill them.

Second, that the rules of organization and functioning of
Sarakatsani groups, stated above, their customs as well as what we have
called "their general social ideas" take the place of rules or prescrip-
tions of law. For, depending on the cases and the circumstances, conformity
to them is required. And they are followed as a result of the mechanism
of "sanction-coercion," either visible or disguised.

Sarakatsani society therefore has law and agencies of law. Though
they are not always apparent, they nonetheless exist.

CRIME AND MISDEMEANORS AMONG THE SARAKATSANI.

693 The Sarakatsani consider a certain number of acts as crimes or
694 misdemeanors. We propose in this section to describe them, as well as
(128) to indicate the punishments associated with them and the means of which
they are carried out.

Homicide and assault.

682 Respect for life and for the integrity of the body is a rule the
violation of which leads to the death of the culprit.

/217/ This rule must not be considered identical with that of the
penal code. A look at the situations in which it is applied will suffice

837 /219 cont./

181 though their nature in this respect were different from that of other
517 human beings. Yet it must be acknowledged, nevertheless, that such relations
are extremely rare.

577 The woman, young girl or wife, who carries on illicit relations risks
831 being put to death either by her relatives or by her husband and the
834 latter's relatives. Though marriage with the partner might possibly, if
621 rarely, let the girl escape punishment, an adulterous woman is invariably
602 punished.

Her lover too is exposed to the same punishment, the carrying out of which is incumbent on the relatives of the woman.

The Sarakatsani maintain that the justification for this severe punishment lies in the fact that the act of the woman (young girl or wife) dishonors her family or her husband and his relatives, and that only blood can wash away the stain.

(171) Moreover, this conviction is not peculiar to our herders; one finds
it all over Greece. In our opinion this is an /220/ ideological sublimation
(182) of two principles: that of the societal control of individuals with regard
(848) to marriage, and that of the control of the legitimacy of descent, of which we have spoken above.

837 Observation shows that this belief in "wounded honor" as well as the
577 drama that it provokes recede and diminish to the extent the children, the
562 girls above all, free themselves from paternal and family authority in the
(573) matter of marriage and marry according to their own choice.
(584)

(684) If a lover is not punished by his own relatives for his illegitimate
acts it is because, in a system dominated by pronounced patriarchy, the man
is a privileged being to whom everything is permitted--a version obviously
not acceptable to the relatives of the woman who accuse him of having
ruined her.

● (626) However, in such a case, the comments, regardless of who makes them,
are much more severe towards the woman than towards her accomplice who

837
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800

/220 cont./

"in the end is a man and is only seeking his pleasure."

Rape and abduction of a young girl.

These two acts are also punished with death by the relatives of the victim. But they too are extremely rare.

The kidnapping, the abduction of a young girl usually is a form of vengeance. It happens that a suitor whose proposals have been evaded by the relatives of the young girl avenges himself by carrying her off forcibly with the help of his friends.

However, if the abductor then does not consent to marry her the men of the victim's family have the duty to kill him. The justification for the punishment resides in the principles which have been set forth above.

The theft of animals.

This act is either a crime or an exploit according to circumstances.

If the thief is caught in the act he is killed on the spot by the shepherds watching their flocks. If he is identified after the deed he must give up the stolen animals in order to acquit himself. If he refuses, he risks being either killed by the injured shepherds or of being deprived of part of his flock in retaliation.

/221/ However, an animal thief not caught is the subject of admiration by all, even his victims. For it is not easy to carry off his exploit. In order to manage it, the thief must crawl and climb, without noise in the dark of night without a moon, across gorges and rocks, elude the watch of armed shepherds, escape the scent of the terrible dogs capable of tearing him to shreds in an instant, carry off the sheep without having them bleat of sound their bells, and disappear with them silently into the night.

On the other hand, to steal animals in a fixed sheepfold of the winter camp is a shameful act that brings disgrace to the one guilty of it.

Finally, this code, so to speak, regarding animal theft implies another rule:

The thief unidentified and therefore unpunished is in any case

/222 cont./

685 Trespassing on their pastures.

The Sarakatsani use force, often armed, to repulse all those who try to trespass on the pastures they have leased.

It is concern for the defense of their interests, indeed their means of subsistence, that prompts them to react in this way; furthermore, they have no other means. Since the danger is to the group, they must face it as a group, the young men constituting the striking force.

683
686 Calumny and defamation.

Those who commit this misdemeanor incur public contempt. Moreover, a man who lets himself be influenced by women's gossip likewise becomes an object of derision.

This contempt is not only constraint of a moral order, but a veritable punishment because it has the same effect as the social disapproval of recalcitrants. We have described the efficacy nature of that sanction in connection with arbitration.

* * * *

671 There remains for us to systematize all the foregoing findings before closing this chapter.

-/225/ SYSTEMATIC AND CRITICAL REFLECTIONS ON SARAKATSANI LAW

The sources of Sarakatsani law are custom, equity and common sense. However: first, though some customs are exclusively legal and therefore identifiable as such, there are others that are polyvalent, whose legal aspects intermingles with other aspects; second, common sense and equity are results whose components derive at one and the same time from legal, moral, religious, mythical or rational judgments--in short, from the entire Sarakatsani cultural system which, at that moment, assumes a legal qualifications and functions. (34)

(113)

34. Similar reflections are to be found in several works, for example Sir. P. Vinogradoff: Custom and Right /cited in English/, p. 21.--René Hubert: Science du Droit, p. 51.-- M. Radin: La censure des coutumes, p. 90-91.--J. Poirier:

/233 cont./

121
671
681
[626] above all the mechanism of social control (p. 208). But morality and religion can play this role only partially, as Radcliffe-Brown himself recognized albeit indirectly because, on the one hand, morality is not imposed by force without a change in their nature, and, on the other hand, punishable acts are not all related to religion. Finally, social control is a very general function which involves several others and is therefore incapable of explaining this specific phenomenon.

Likewise, Radcliffe-Brown proposes that when sanctions are taken by individuals or groups against individuals and groups (vengeance, duel, blood revenge, etc.), under the control and with the approval of society, diffuse sanctions "of public opinion" /cited in English/ are involved. [114] This conclusion does not take us unawares. Since our author denies the legal character of the terrible sanctions enumerated above, applied collectively and according to a procedure determined in advance, it is natural that he should deny this character to these additional, more individualized sanctions.

[208]
[626] We have shown, moreover, that public opinion is not able to impose sanctions exceeding disapproval.

121
671
681 The question therefore remains open. We believe that the perspective offered by our own position makes it possible to avoid the confusion of law with other social regulations and to avoid the paradoxical idea that societies can live without law when they do not have a specific judicial apparatus.

Marcel Mauss, for his part (chapter VII of his Manual), says: "In societies that ethnography singles out all legal phenomena are moral phenomena, without exception; which does not mean that all moral phenomena are necessarily legal in the strict sense" (p. 110). It remains to be seen how one can distinguish law from morality. /234/ "Legal phenomena," says Mauss, "are organized moral phenomena (p. 111)...We know the presence of morality and religion only from the presence of infraction and the idea of sanction. There is moral obligation...when there is diffuse sanction;

/240 cont./

(577)
(182) Sarakatsani life, on the other, thus appear clearly--the first depending on the second and the second finding considerable support in the first.

* * * *

/241/ These reflections open the way to the study of another problem, that of the process through which morality actually controls the life of individuals and groups.

(167) Observation shows that their morality is strong. It is the result, first of all, of the moral education of individuals, which commences at a tender age and is carried out chiefly by the extended family, as we know. Next, come the example and the putting forward by society of what G. Gurvitch calls "ideal symbolic images," (7)

7. See G. Gurvitch: "Sociologie de la vie morale" in

Traité vol. II, p. 152.

which hold a special attraction for men and which correspond to models presented by a good headman, a good father and mother, a good shepherd, a brave Sarakatsani, etc., or by a truly communal family, by the perfect Tséligato--goals toward which every human act must constantly lead. But there is more. It is the mechanism of approbation or of censure proper to morality which is supported by the direct control of behavior (particularly intense in groups such as this whose range is limited) and which expresses itself in valuation of concrete behavior, presupposing the idea of "honor" as the Sarakatsani conceive it.

(22) This particular point merits attention. For it is through the idea of honor and the conditions according to which "a man is honorable or not" that one can: 1st, show the margin that Sarakatsani society leaves to individuals to exercise choice in favor of this or that orientation of their action (which constitutes the essence of the moral phenomenon); 2nd, determine the line of demarcation separating morality from law; 3rd, discover the hierarchical relationship of these two types of social regulation in relation to one another.

/242/cont./

577 The Sarakatsani may therefore take his choice between non-distinction,
dishonor and honor. These are the limits within which he may deploy his
moral activity.

577 These alternatives have their justification in the risks that one
156 runs socially by the choice one makes. By choosing non-distinction the
subject injures only himself. By opting for infamy (though this may seem
paradoxical), that is to say, by violating fundamental rules or denying
the "minimum morality," the individual or the group endanger the collectivity
which then would react against them with severity. By preferring honor one
becomes a pillar of social life, for, thanks to the conduct and example one
offers to all, one contributes to its solidity. Honor is the reward to
those who have embodied Sarakatsani morality. They become "morality in
person."

577 /243/ As for the line of demarcation separating morality from law, the
671 foregoing remarks show that the major requirements constitute the common
681 threshold. It is in terms of the importance of the infraction committed,
therefore the importance of the risks run by non-conformity, that the
foregoing passage, analyzed from the standpoint of legal reactions will be
understood, and that the mechanism of sanction and coercion is activated.

626 Thus, the major moral requirements and law may intermingle, the difference
residing in the concrete fact of the intensity of social repression: either
society is content simply to scorn the culprit or it decides to react more
violently.

577 It follows that morality, as social control, occupies a prominent place
626 among the Sarakatsani, though it cannot be placed above the law. Despite
671 its rigidity, especially with reference to major requirements, it comes after
law, though it complements and aids the latter by its own prestige.

577 The regulation of the actions of these herders, tough, intrepid, indepen-
181 dent human beings, true fighters ceaselessly striving to conquer innumerable
671 difficulties and obstacles, requires means more powerful than morals, hence

/336 cont./

765
152
626
[562] Obviously, all these manifestations are social and not religious. They are based on the social control of feelings, the regulation of their intensity and their externalization. /337/ A widow's mourning is the external mark of her status, since, as we have said, the status of the woman must always be apparent. And if she mourns for life it is because the loss of her husband means for her, and in the scale of Sarakatsani social values, an inestimable loss which she must forever regret.

775 MAN IN THE BEYOND.
THE LIVING AND THE DEAD.--GHOSTS.

The Sarakatsani believe that after death man continues to live, but an existence as different from earthly life as from that assumed by Christianity.

The soul lives spiritually, but also anthropomorphically. And the dead person may become a ghost. The idea of resurrection exists. But for the Sarakatsani the cycle of life complies more with non-Christian beliefs.

775
724 On the mouth of the deceased a silver coin or a trinket is placed, so that he has the wherewithal to pay his passage to Hades--a reminiscence of the ancient practice of paying Charon to cross the Styx. If he does not have the means of paying, he will be destined for the nether regions.

Next to the corpse, and again on the basis of non-Christian beliefs, are placed cigarettes, apples, oranges, candy, combs, small pocket mirrors, etc. These objects will serve for his own use in the beyond. The fruits are gifts for those who died before him, and the donors add oral messages or messages written on pieces of paper. However, if the deceased is old, these objects are not placed on his deathbed. Next to men, their shepherd's crook is placed. Next to women, their distaff.

531 /368 cont./
532
533
534
535
536
537
538

with an art that has almost entirely disappeared at the present time.

/369/ Finally, it is necessary to mention the non-symbolic woven motifs and the narratives and tales. The latter, works of oral literature, recount stories in which kings, archons, ladies, beautiful girls, sorcerers, evil spirits, ogres, fairies, etc., take an active part and come face to face in intrigues which end in the triumph of good over evil, of the persecuted beauty over the evil sorcerer, of man over evil spirits. (5)

S. C. Hög: in the work cited reproduces a large number of Sarakatsani tales and narratives.

However, there is another kind of account and narrative which, in addition to their character and the talent of the narrator, show a utilitarian aspect and, on the basis of this fact, belong to the "incorporated" art. In the course of the command feasts organized for the entire family on the occasion of the major holidays, the old men are invited to tell, for the sake of the young generations, stories that extol the conduct of the ancients in all kinds of circumstances. Thus, their descendants find at their disposal models of behavior derived from their ancestors, which will guide them throughout life along the lines dictated and required by tradition. Let us emphasize that this is one of the ways the extended family, of which we have already spoken, functions to promote social control.

.....

53 The origins of the art existing among the Sarakatsani thus vary according to the nature of its manifestations. When it is "incorporated," it is a purely Sarakatsani art. When it is "free" we rediscover cultural borrowings, songs and motifs coming from other Greek social environments, however without profoundly altering the Sarakatsani artistic style.

[177]

182 /382 cont./
291
261 in family or society symbolic ornaments bringing about fecundity among
181 women).

182 Nevertheless, every economico-social system has need of another
671 system of rules which will socially guarantee the first. The Sarakatsani
thus introduce their law first of all, based on custom, equity and
common sense, which means that this law, along with crystallized rules,
includes spontaneous and ad hoc prescriptions. It sanctions the fundamen-
tal organizing rules of their life and the functioning of their social
and economic institutions which it makes their own. Its salient character-
istic is to favor cooperation and its results, and to combat individualism,
182 Its chief concern is to protect kinship and herding by its penal provisions;
671 that is why it does not hesitate to threaten miscreants with capital
681 punishment (the vendetta, for example). In any case, and in order to
impose itself, it introduces a mechanism of adjudication, of sanction and
coercion, sometimes not apparent, which are in keeping with isolation (not
to resort to the justice of "the foreigner") and to the necessity of showing
itself effective, though there does not exist among them a specific legal
● (626) apparatus. The principle of conformity finds its best means of expression
here, while enforcing the mechanism in question. On the other hand,
182 morality, by its mechanism of honor or dishonor maintains all the rules
511 enumerated, integrating them into its principal values such as tradition,
181 family, chastity, community, bravery and independence, which basically
represent merely the main ideas of Sarakatsani life elevated to the level
of morality.

There is nothing astonishing in this state of affairs. The moment a
society accepts and proposes a certain number of fundamental principles
on which it bases its life, it is altogether normal that these principles
be raised to moral values. The contrary would result in meaninglessness.

/398 cont./

578 nature an impurity that is incompatible with the norms it proclaims
121 and that expresses itself concretely in a certain amount of injustice,
insensitivity, cruelty..." (1)

1. C. Lévi-Strauss: Tristes Tropiques /Sad Tropics/,
p. 417.

578 This assertion, equally valid for Sarakatsani society, opens the way
571 to the study of its imperfections, that is, the asymmetries of social
relations which are peculiar to it and which arise from the total social
phenomenon and from its structure. These asymmetries ceaselessly threaten
the structure.

Now, in studying the internal hierarchy of the family group we see
that the subjugation of small lineages and conjugal families to the
extended family, of junior age groups /399/ to the senior ones, women
to men, families of participants in the Tséligato and the participants
themselves to the Tséligas and to his family carries with it the
potential germs of revolt. If the revolt becomes reality it will
completely change the life of our herders.

578 However, such a development seems excluded and this thanks to the
dynamics of many factors.

578 The first of these factors is indisputably the socially guided
182 preparation of the Sarakatsani as individuals to accept in advance the
155 norms governing the subjugation and the hierarchization, with everything
183 oppressive and unjust that they include. The preparation in question
presupposes a molding of character and the implanting in the collective,
as well as the individual, mentality of a certain number of ideas, notions,
and principles in terms of which individuals and groups are made to see
their lives, or, not to be able to imagine a different life - which
amounts to the same thing.

183 /399 cont./

578 In the second place, there is constraint in the general sense of
182 the term. It appears first in the influence of the Tséligas, the head,
626 who, to the extent that he has a strong personality and a true capacity
494 to govern, is in a position to impose on his subjects the traditional
[554] norms by which the family group functions and thus to safeguard its
cohesion and its content /sic: "son conteny"/. Constraint manifests
(671) itself next in law and morality, the two aspects of group constraint
(577) which, armed with social support, act sovereignly in favor of the socio-
cultural status quo. The analysis of the way they are enforced has
demonstrated their effectiveness.

578 In the third place are the idealization and mythization of the
182 "Sarakatsani condition," the elevation to the rank of supreme value and
183 myth every cultural solution to each specific problem. No matter that
the application of these solutions, coldly considered, entails priva-
tions, concessions, and demands abnegation or sacrifice! In psychoanalytic
terms, one might call this phenomenon sublimation.

578 Religion for its part, with its teaching and traditions that
791 prescribe obedience to headmen, to elders, and justify the subordination
183 of the woman, while sanctioning the traditions by salvation, also supports
182 the social edifice by determining behavior and its motivation, that is
to say, by determining collective attitudes.

578 Finally, we encounter the mechanism of "obligation-compensation"
675 /400/ of which we have spoken above, (2)

182 2. See above, p. 205-206, etc.
and to which we should like to add some details--first of all terminolog-
ically. The notion of alienation is taken here in its primitive and
(121) legal meaning (Lalande) according to which alienatus is not free. Thus,
it is not identical with mental alienation or with alienation according

/401 cont./

528
182
183
121 society the "injustices and incompatibilities between norms and their realization." according to the formula of Lévi-Strauss, but also the means of overcoming them, and that in a constructive way.

As for the threats against the equilibrium arising from social units other than the family, we should like to emphasize that they are minor. The hostility of Sarakatsani society toward non-conformists exerts sufficient constraint to intimidate those who might possible violate the adopted socio-cultural models, this constraint consolidates both these models and the social equilibrium. Furthermore, since surrounding society is indifferent to the Sarakatsani who themselves insist on preserving their isolation, and does not interfere with their lives, it does not upset the equilibrium nor endanger its continuance. Or rather, that is what went on up to the last decades / "decennies?"/

* * * *

121 /402/ Nevertheless, other threats arise from one-dimensional
178 elements of Sarakatsani society, and present the possibility of changing
182 the latter.

In fact, if the technology or crafts, the organization of the family and the Tséligato, the economic system, law and morality, knowledge, magic or religion changed, they would bring about changes capable of loosening the general structure from top to bottom, given the close dialectical bonds existing between them.

However, this possibility is slight, for several reasons. First of all, because the change of one of these elements would encounter the resistance of all the others, precisely because of the dialectical link. In the second place, because all these elements are cultural solutions to concrete problems and their effectiveness has been demonstrated by experience. No one would agree to modify them in favor of a non-proven

/409 cont./

121 829 462	Faculties to be developed	Men	Women
	Knowledge.....	Techniques related to male work. Rudiments of letters.	Techniques reserved to women. Illiterate.
	Beliefs.....	Traditional mythology (mother-goddess). Orthodox Christianity.	The same.
	Aesthetic aptitudes.....	Storytellers, singers, dancers. Wood sculptors. Flute players.	The same. Embroidery.

/410/ This table enables us to draw several conclusions.

121
181 The choice made by Sarakatsani society among the possible aspects of human behavior, thereafter presented to its members in the form of models of capacities to be acquired, etc., is made in terms of the fundamental ideas or principles ruling its life. A comparison between them and the preceding table suffices to provide an illustration.

The concrete content of each skill, each aptitude, etc., corresponds absolutely to the various categories of socio-cultural works of the Sarakatsani, on all levels of their social life.

182
626 The result is that their total social phenomenon is reflected wholly in their psyche. Given, on the one hand, the strong integration of the Sarakatsani in their society and, on the other hand, the direct and intense social control of individuals, it is clear that their social world is deeply engraved in them.

829 We thus come to another question: Do the Sarakatsani have the opportunity to develop capacities, virtues, faculties, etc., other than those which have been offered by their society? The study of their morality and above all their mechanism of dividing people into categories of "honored, not honored and dishonored," on the one hand, and their criteria for appreciating the artist, on the other hand, are very revealing.

/410 cont./

121 They show that the latitude offered the Sarakatsani to give free rein
181 to their originality, namely to their temperament, their talents,
their imagination, is not very great. The latitude is provided in
advance and obeys predictable models. This formula does not mean that
our herders are automats whose strings are pulled by their society and
their culture, but merely that they are not supposed to go beyond
certain norms. The fact that they are honored when they distinguish
themselves in accomplishing certain tasks perfectly shows that
Sarakatsani society knows how to appreciate talent and originality.

121 However, it does not permit the non-observance of the "prescribed."

181 This means that the Sarakatsani become "typical" individuals. (2)

2. See M. Mead's distinction between "typical" and
"atypical": Ibid., p. 268.

Those who are atypical are not tolerated. They are, in fact
threatened with social banishment. Sarakatsani social molding is
therefore total. And, to express this statement on another level, we
121 might say that among them traditional cultural works /411/ flow into
181 their psyches; in other words, their total social and psychological
phenomena overlap almost completely. (3)

3. Inspired by G. Gurvitch.

Nevertheless, Sarakatsani society is interested not only in the
molding of its members, but also in their destiny. It provides for them
socially, it puts at their disposal its organization and its means. All
the solutions of their vital problems that it has adopted converge toward
"a primitive, socio-economic planning," according to a formula by Radin,
(4)

4. See P. Radin: Le monde de l'homme primitif, pp. 99
and 201.